No. 5

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1962

WILLIAM J. POWERS, JR., *Petitioner,*

vs.

PAUL SLATON, *Respondent.*

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT.

WILLIAM J. POWERS
664 Oakton Street
Des Plaines, Illinois
Plaintiff Pro Se

UNITED STATES LAW PRINTING CO., CHICAGO 18, ILL. LA review 5-6581

INDEX

	PAGE
Citations to Opinions Below	1, 2
Jurisdiction	2
Questions Presented	2, 3
Constitutions and Statutes Involved	3
Statement of the Case	4
Reasons for Granting the Writ	10
Argument:	
Point One	12
Point Two	14
Point Three	17
Point Four	26
Summary	28
Conclusion	28
Appendices:	
A. Opinion of the District Court	29, 30
B. Opinion of the Court of Appeals	31, 32, 33
C. Plaintiff's Motion for Extension of Time for Filing Petition for Review	34
Letter from Clerk of Court of Appeals	35, 36
Letter from Clerk of Court of Appeals	36
Order Granted by the Honorable Potter Stewart Extending Time to File Petition for Writ of Certiorari	37

PAGE

D. Report Number 1267, 72nd Congress, First Session 38, 39

E. Letter of May 15, 1947 From Veterans Administration Hospital to Clerk of Circuit Court of Fayette County, Kentucky 40

F. Affidavit of physicians appointed on May 17, 1947 and filed on May 17, 1947 ..... 42, 43

G. Chapter 16, Acts of 1936, Commonwealth of Kentucky 44, 45

H. Kentucky Revised Statute 202.110 (216aa-77) Contents of Physicians Certificate, etc. 46

Kentucky Revised Statute 202.120(261aa-77a) Thirty-Five day Commitment Statute in effect on May 17, 1947 ..... 46, 47

I. Chapter 16, Acts of 1928, Commonwealth of Kentucky 47-52

J. Selections from Bill of Rights of Kentucky 53, 54

K. Chapter 173, Acts of 1944, Commonwealth of Kentucky 55

L. Petition for Appointment of Committee Filed August 24, 1949 ..... 56, 57

CASES CITED

Ableman v. Booth, 21 Howard 506; 16 Law Ed. 169 ..... 26, 27

Arlington Hotel Company v. Fant, 278 U.S. 439; 49 S. Ct. 227; 73 Law. Ed. 447 ..... 10, 14

Civil Rights Cases, 109 U.S. 3; 3 S. Ct. 18; 27 Law Ed. 835 19

Commonwealth v. King, 252 Ky. 699; 68 S.W. 2nd 45 13

PAGE

Fort Leavenworth Railroad Company v. Lowe, 114 U.S. 525; 5 S. Ct. 995; 29 Law Ed. 264 ..... 10, 15, 16

Howard v. Commissioners of the Sinking Fund of the City of Louisville, 344 U.S. 624; 73 S. Ct. 465; 97 Law Ed. 617 13

McFarland v. Commonwealth, 249 Ky. 129; 60 S.W. 2nd 360 22

Meyers v. State of Nebraska 262 U.S. 390; 43 S. Ct. 625; 67 Law Ed. 1042 20

Mullane v. Central Hanover Bank and Trust Company, 339 U.S. 306; 70 S. Ct. 652; 94 Law Ed. 865 23

Paul v. United States, 371 U.S. 243; 83 S. Ct. 426; 9 Law Ed. 2nd 292 ..... 10, 14, 15

Ex parte Romero, 51 N.M. 201; 181 P. 2nd 811 23

Shelley v. Kraehmer, 334 U.S. 1; 68 S. Ct. 836; 92 Law Ed. 1161 ..... 20, 21

Simon v. Craft, 182 U.S. 427; 21 S. Ct. 836; 45 Law Ed. 1165 25

Smith v. Nall, 242 S.W. 2nd 755 24

Appeal of Sleeper, 147 Maine 302; 181 Atlantic 2nd 115 23

Stewart v. Taylor, 111 Ky. 247; 63 S.W. 733 23

Tarble's Case, 13 Wall 397; 20 Law Ed. 597 27

Thompson v. Whitman, 18 Wall 457; 21 Law Ed. 897 ..... 17, 18

United States v. Oregon, 366 U.S. 643; 81 S. Ct. 1278; 6 Law Ed. 2nd 575 ..... 10, 13

Williams v. North Carolina, 325 U.S. 226; 65 S. Ct. 1092; 89 Law Ed. 1577 18

STATUTES AND CONSTITUTIONS CITED

PAGE

Constitution of the United States, Art. 1, Sec. 8, Cl. 17 ..... 14, 15, 16, 17

Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution 19, 20, 21

Bill of Rights of Constitution of Kentucky 22, 23, 24

Chapter 16, Acts of 1936, of Kentucky 17, 22, 24

Chapter 16, Acts of 1928, of Kentucky 22, 23, 24, 25, 26

Kentucky Revised Statute 3.010 ..... 13, 14

Act of June 23, 1932; 47 Stat. 332; 72nd Congress, 1st Sess. 13

MISCELLANEOUS SOURCES CITED

Report of the Interdepartmental Committee For the Study of Jurisdiction Over Federal Areas Within the States Part 1 (1956); Part 2 (1957) entitled "Jurisdiction Over Federal Areas Within the States." 11

Annual Report of the Director of the Veterans Bureau for the year of 1929 12

Annual Report of the Administrator of Veterans Affairs for the year of 1931 12

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1962

No.

WILLIAM J. POWERS, JR.,

Petitioner,

vs.

PAUL SLATON,

Respondent.

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT.

Petitioner, William J. Powers, Jr., a citizen of Illinois and plaintiff-appellant below, prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit entered on the 13th day of March 1963, in the cause pending therein entitled *William J. Powers, Jr.* v. *Paul Slaton*, Docket Number 14,972.

OPINIONS BELOW

The opinion of the trial court, the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Kentucky, sitting

at Lexington, was entered on March 29, 1962 and is included herein in Appendix "A".

The opinion of the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit is reported below at ..... F. 2nd ....., and is included herein in Appendix "B".

Plaintiff's Motion for extension of time to file a petition for review and letter from the Clerk of the Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit returning the motion as untimely are included herein in Appendix "C".

JURISDICTION

The decision and judgment of the Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit sought to be reviewed was entered on March 13, 1963 and has not been reported as yet but is filed with Carl Reuss, Clerk of the Court of Appeal for the Sixth Circuit in Docket No. 14,972.

The jurisdiction of this Court to review the judgment below by writ of certiorari is conferred by Title 28 U.S.C. 1254(1); 2101(c) 2106.

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the United States Hospital Reservation, at Lexington, Kentucky—on which is located a United States Veterans Administration Hospital—is a federal enclave under the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States within the meaning of Article 1, Section 8, Clause 17 of the Constitution of the United States.

2. Whether an inmate of the Veterans Hospital who is confined therein by the government of the United States is thereby subject to the jurisdiction of the Circuit Court of Fayette County, Kentucky.

3. Whether a thirty-five day commitment order entered against an inmate of the Veterans Hospital on the same day a petition was filed asking for a lunacy inquest violates the due process of law contrary to the Fourteenth Amendment.

4. Whether a lunacy inquest, growing out of the thirty-five day commitment violated the due process of law contrary to the Fourth, Fifth, and Fourteenth Amendments where the inmate of a Veterans Hospital is restrained within a federal enclave and prevented by federal officers from appearing and defending himself.

CONSTITUTIONS AND STATUTES INVOLVED

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 17, of the Constitution of the United States.

Article IV, Section 2 of the Constitution of the United States.

The Fourth Amendment of the Constitution of the United States.

The Fifth Amendment of the Constitution of the United States.

The Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution of the United States.

The Bill of Rights of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Kentucky in Sections 1, 2, 7, 10, 14, 16, and 26.

Chapter 16 of the Acts of 1936 of the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

Chapter 16 of the Acts of 1928 of the Commonwealth of Kentucky which in 1946 were also found in Chapter 202 of the Kentucky Revised Statutes.

Kentucky Revised Statutes 3.010 "Consent of State of Acquisition of Lands."

STATEMENT OF THE CASE.

A. Chronology of events from January of 1942 until May of 1947.

The plaintiff, William J. Powers, Jr., was a twenty-four year old resident of Chicago, Illinois and a citizen of the State of Illinois when he was inducted into the Army of the United States by reason of the Selective Service Act on January 8, 1942.

The plaintiff was sent to Fort Knox, Kentucky, in the latter part of January of 1942 for basic training and remained there until May of 1942 when he was sent to Officer Candidate Class No. 4 at the Armored Second at Fort Knox.

The plaintiff was discharged for the convenience of the government, to accept a commission, on August 21, 1942. (R. 25)

The following day, August 22, 1942 the plaintiff was commissioned as a Second Lieutenant, Cavalry, Army of the United States, for the duration of the emergency plus six months. (R. 27)

The plaintiff thereafter served as an officer of the Army until 1943 when he was promoted to First Lieutenant. He continued his service in various capacities until January of 1946 when he was sent to the Separation Center at Camp Beale, California for relief from active duty by reason of length of service. His terminal leave expired in March of 1946 and he reverted to an inactive duty status. (R. 31-34)

The plaintiff was offered and accepted a second commission at the Separation Center but this time as a First Lieutenant, Cavalry, Officers Reserve Corps, Army of the United States, under the authority of the National Defense Act of 1933, as amended, for a period of five years. (R. 28-30)

In June of 1940, the plaintiff received a letter from the Commanding General, Second Army, urging the plaintiff to return to active duty because of a critical shortage of officers with plaintiff's training and military background. (R. 35-38)

In September of 1946 the plaintiff returned to active duty at Fort Knox for one year. (R. 37, par. 21)

In October of 1946 the plaintiff was hopitalized at Fort Knox through a series of circumstances which the Department of the Army has never explained to the plaintiff.

Within a very few days the plaintiff was transferred to Valley Forge General Hospital at Phoenixville, Pennsylvania where he remained most of the time until May of 1947 except when he was on leave.

The plaintiff appeared before an Army Retiring Board on March 25, 1947 and was given sixty days leave to await the approval of the decision of the Retiring Board by the War Department.

The plaintiff returned to Valley Forge General Hospital before the sixty days leave had expired to inquire about the approval of the decision of the Retiring Board by the War Department.

Instead of finding out whether it had been approved, he was ordered to report to the Veterans Administration Hospital at Lexington, Kentucky on or about May 4, 1947, which he did on March 4, 1947. (R. 39-40, par. 8; R. 41, par. 33)

B. The Thirty-Five Day Commitment of May 17, 1947.

When the plaintiff reported to the Veterans Hospital on May 4, 1947 he was confined in a locked ward by the hospital staff and not allowed to leave the premises.

On May 15, 1947 the clinical director and a ward doctor wrote a letter to the Clerk of the Circuit Court of Fayette explaining that the plaintiff was a patient there and asking that an inquest be held concerning him. (See Appendix "E")

On May 17, 1947 a petition was filed in the Circuit Court of Fayette County, Kentucky by one L. H. Mulligan that "he was reliably informed that William J. Powell" was a person of unsound mind and a lunatic and asking that an inquest be held concerning him. (R. 9-10)

On May 17, 1947 two local doctors, Mulligan and Shannon, were appointed by the Circuit Court to examine the alleged lunatic and report to the Court. (R. 9-10)

On May 17, 1947 the local doctors filed their affidavit that they had examined the alleged lunatic and that he would require further care. The affidavit was merely a printed form issued by the Welfare Department and did not state any facts upon which their opinion was based. (See Appendix "F").

On May 17, 1947 the Judge of the Circuit Court issued a thirty-five day commitment order and an order of arrest against the plaintiff under the authority of the provisions of Chapter 16, of the Acts of 1936. (See Appendix "F")

The plaintiff was confined in the Veterans Hospital all of the time these events of May 17, 1947—a Saturday—were occurring and had no knowledge of any of them. (Appendix "E")

C. The Lunacy Inquest of June 9, 1947 Concerning the Plaintiff.

On June 9, 1947 a lunacy inquest concerning the plaintiff was held in the Circuit Court of Fayette County, Kentucky without the presence of the plaintiff and he was adjudged a person of unsound mind; that his mother was unknown; that his father was dead; that he had been of unsound mind for several years; and that he was a resident of Lexington, Kentucky. (R. 9)

The presiding judge, who was required by statute to prepare a history of the patient's case, found that the alleged mental illness began five years before June of 1947 when the plaintiff was twenty-five years of age or in other words it began just after the plaintiff was inducted into military service in 1942. (R. 9-10)

D. First Appointment of a Committee on June 26, 1947.

In June of 1947, plaintiff's wife after consultation with some members of the staff of the Veterans Administration was sent to a Lexington attorney who filed a petition in the County Court of Fayette County requesting the appointment of the plaintiff's wife as committee so that she would be able to receive the retired pay of the plaintiff for the support of herself and their infant daughter while the plaintiff was in the Veterans Hospital.

E. The Second Appointment of a Committee on August 24, 1949 and the First Appearance of the Defendant, Paul Slaton.

The record of the County Court of Fayette County, Kentucky, which is Appendix "L" reveals that the wife of the plaintiff resigned on August 24, 1949 as committee and that the defendant Paul Slaton, appeared for the Citizens Bank and Trust Company and took an oath of office in a proceeding for the appointment of a committee

although the plaintiff had returned to his home in Chicago, Illinois and had been residing again in Chicago since the first part of February of 1949. (Appendix "B")

This is the first recorded appearance of the defendant, Paul Slaton, in any of the proceedings referred to in this action. So far as is known to the plaintiff, the defendant had no part of any proceeding before August 24, 1949.

F. Institution of the present action in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Kentucky at Lexington on July 17, 1961.

On July 17, 1961, the plaintiff filed suit, claiming diversity of citizenship as the basis of jurisdiction, against the defendant; Paul Slaton, asking that he be compelled to cease and desist from interfering with plaintiff's right to receive retired pay from the Department of the Army. (R. 2)

The plaintiff further alleged the existence of substantial federal questions as would appear later in the complaint. (R. 2)

On August 7, 1961, the defendant filed a motion to dismiss the complaint of the plaintiff denying the plaintiff's allegations and supporting the motion with an affidavit of the defendant to which was attached records of proceedings in the Circuit and County Court of Fayette County. (R. 8)

On August 18, 1961 the plaintiff filed a motion to oppose the admission of the orders and judgment of the Circuit Court of Fayette County into evidence against him together with the plaintiff's counter-affidavit supported with exhibits of records of military service and residence. (R. 11-20 inc.; R. 21-44 inc.)

On September 7, 1961 the plaintiff filed additional affidavits of two reputable attorneys of Chicago that they had known and seen the plaintiff in Chicago all during the period from about March of 1949 until September of 1961.

The motion to dismiss under Rule 12 was later considered by the Court as a motion for summary judgment under Rule 56 and was briefed and argued. The District Court dismissed for failure to state a cause of action against the defendant. The District Court did not make any finding of fact.

The Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit confirmed the order of dismissal on March 13, 1963. (Appendix "B")

Neither the District Court or the Court of Appeals made any reference to the plaintiff's motion to oppose the admission of the records and judgment of the Circuit Court of Fayette County, Kentucky into evidence against him nor his counter-affidavit nor the supporting exhibits.

All that the Court of Appeals said about the motion was contained in the next to the last paragraph of the opinion as follows:

> "Appellant presents additional questions for review by this court involving the validity of the State Court proceedings. The courts of the Commonwealth of Kentucky afford adequate remedies to a party seeking a determination as to the validity of State Court proceedings." (Appendix "B")

The Court of Appeals thereby summarily dismissed plaintiff's argument that if the State Court proceedings of 1947 were void and that the defendant and any others associated with him were trespassers against the right of the plaintiff to have his own personal property.

The plaintiff now wishes to bring this case before the Court on a writ of certiorari to review the decisions of the lower courts because this Court has never ruled on the questions presented.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT.

This Supreme Court has ruled many times on the nature and extent of the jurisdiction exercised by the Federal Government over federal enclaves under the authority of Article 1, Section 8, Clause 17 of the Constitution of the United States of America. See *Fort Leavenworth Railroad Company* v. *Lowe*, 114 U.S. 525; 5 S. Ct. 995; 29 Law Ed. 264 and *Arlington Hotel Company* v. *Fant*, 278 U.S. 439; 49 S. Ct. 227; 73 Law Ed. 447.

The most recent case known to the plaintiff is that *Paul* v. *United States*, 371 U.S. 245; 83 Sup. Ct. 426; 9 Law Ed. 2nd 292.

This Court has never had occasion in the past to rule on the nature and extent of the jurisdiction exercised by the Federal Government over Veterans Administration Hospitals, although part of the problem was discussed in *United States* v. *Oregon*, 366 U.S. 643; 81 S. Ct. 1278; 6 Law Ed. 2nd 575 where this Court held that the distribution of the estate of a Veteran who died resident in a Veterans Hospital was a matter of federal law and not state law.

It is well known that it is the established policy of the Veterans Administration to seek and obtain exclusive jurisdiction over all Veterans Administration facilities with the exception of a few scattered offices so the administrative staff of the Veterans Arministration does not have to comply with state laws. This has been particularly true in regard to the licensing of physicians and surgeons, medical personnel generally, police and fire regulations of the several states, garbage and disposal regulations of the several states, and public health regulations of the sev-

eral states to mention a few reasons. These conditions and reasons were discussed quite fully in the *Report of the Interdepartmental Committee for The Study of Jurisdiction Over Federal Areas Within The States* submitted by the Attorney-General to the President in 1956 and 1957.

Both the District Court and the Court of Appeals completely ignored the existence of these substantial federal questions and based their decisions on the premise that th defendant was protected in his actions by the existence of the state judgments.

It would seem therefore that the first question to decide is that of the status of the Veterans Hospital as a federal enclave.

ARGUMENT.

1. Whether the United States Hospital Reservation, at Lexington, Kentucky—on which is located a United States Veterans Administration Hospital—is a federal enclave under the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States within the meaning of Article 1, Section 8, Clause 17 of the Constitution of the United States.

The Annual Report of the Director of the Veterans Bureau for 1929 stated on page 14 that a 250 bed hospital at Lexington, Kentucky would be constructed with funds from the appropriation of the Act of May 23, 1928; 45 Stat. 715; 70th Congress, 1st Session.

The Annual Report of the Administrator of Veterans Affairs for 1931 stated on page 20 that the Veterans Administration owned the lands and buildings at all Veterans Hospitals (except one hospital under lease at Kansas City, Mo.), specifically including the one at Lexington.

In this regard it must be remembered that Revised Statute 355, as amended, provided that all lands for public purposes purchased by public funds could be acquired only after the Attorney-General had secured a clear title for the United States to such lands.

The only retro-cession of title by the United States to the land of the Veterans Administration Hospital at Lexington, Kentucky was discussed in House Report No. 1267 of the 72nd Congress, 1st Session wherein a fifteen foot strip of land in front of the hospital was recommended for retro-cession and was in fact retro-ceded by Congress to the Commonwealth of Kentucky by the Act

of June 23, 1932; 47 Stat. 332; 72nd Congress, 1st Session to enable the Commonwealth of Kentucky to construct a turnpike past the front of the hospital. (See Appendix "D")

The consent of the Commonwealth of Kentucky to the acquisition of lands for public purposes was given by the Act of August 16, 1892, later known as Section 2376 of the Kentucky Statutes (1903 edition) and in 1947 was known as Kentucky Revised Statute 3.010. (See Appendix "K")

This statute was construed by the Court of Appeals of Kentucky in *Commonwealth* v. *King*, 252 Ky. 699; 68 S.W. 2nd 45 where that Court fully discussed most of the leading cases from this Court and decided that the Legislature of Kentucky had not reserved any jurisdiction under the statute except the right to serve civil and criminal process within a federal territory for causes that arose within the Commonwealth outside the federal territory.

This same statute has been construed once by this Court in the case of *Howard* v. *Commissioners of the Sinking Fund of the City of Louisville*, 344 U.S. 624; 73 S. Ct. 465; 97 Law Ed. 617, where this Court held that Congress had retro-ceded jurisdiction under the Buck Act to tax personal property in the case in question.

The third qualification for exclusive jurisdiction was discussed in *United States* v. *Oregon*, 366 U.S. 643; 81 S. Ct. 1278; 6 Law Ed. 2nd 575, where this Court held that:

> "Congress undoubtedly has the power—under its constitutional powers to raise armies and navies and to conduct wars—to pay pensions, and to build hospitals and homes for veterans."

It was said by this Court in *Arlington Hotel* v. *Fant*, 278 U.S. 439, at page 455 that:

> "It was certainly a wise provision which with the consent of the State brought within exclusive national jurisdiction the hospital buildings and accessories and all the forty-four springs from which the healing waters came in order to secure to the Government their complete police protection, preservation and control. This justified acquisition of the springs and hospital for the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States under clause 17, Section 8, Article 1 of the Constitution."

There can be no effective argument against the premise that a Veterans Hospital is within the power of Congress to establish as a necessary public building and establishment within the meaning of Article 1, Section 8, Clause 17 of the Constitution.

This case now before this Court presents a situation where Congress has purchased lands for a public purpose with the consent of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Kentucky investing the United States with exclusive jurisdiction under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 17 of the Federal Constitution.

2. Whether an inmate of the Veterans Hospital who is confined therein by the government of the United States is thereby subject to the jurisdiction of the Circuit Court of Fayette County, Kentucky.

This Court seems to have already decided the question in substance by such opinions as that in *Paul* v. *United States*, 371 U.S. 245, where at page 263, this Court said:

> "The power of Congress over federal enclaves that come within the scope of Art. 1, Sec. 8, cl. 17, is obviously the same as the power of Congress over the District of Columbia. The cases make clear that the

grant of 'exclusive' legislative power of Art. 1, Sec. 8, Cl. 17, by its own weight, bars state regulation without specific congressional action."

Also, in *Paul* v. *United States*, *supra*, at page 267, this Court said:

> "Whether the United States has acquired exclusive jurisdiction over a federal enclave is a federal question. As stated in *Silas Mason* v. *Tax Commission*, 302 U.S. 186, 197:
>
> > 'The question of exclusive territorial jurisdiction is distinct. That question assumes the absence of any interference with the exercise of the functions of the Federal Government and is whether the United States has acquired exclusive legislative authority so as to debar the State from exercising any legislative authority, including its taxing and police power, in relation to the property and activities of individuals and corporations within the territory.'"

In an earlier case, that of *Fort Leavenworth R. R. Co.* v. *Lowe*, 114 U.S. 525; this Court said at pages 532-533 that:

> "When the title is acquired by purchase by consent of the Legislatures of the States, the federal jurisdiction is exclusive of all State Authority. This follows from the declaration of the Constitution that Congress shall have 'like authority' over such places as it has over the district which is the seat of the government; that is, the power of 'exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever'. Broader or clearer language could not be used to exclude all other authority than that of Congress; and that no other authority can be exercised over them has been the uniform opinion of Federal and State tribunals, and of the Attorneys General."

And also in *Fort Leavenworth*, *supra*, at page 537, this Court said in quoting *Sinks* v. *Reese*, 19 Ohio St. 306, with approval, that:

> "And it was held that, upon purchase of the territory by the United States, with the consent of the Legislature of the State, the general government became invested with exclusive jurisdiction over it and its appurtenances in all cases whatsoever; and that the inmates of such asylum resident within the territory, being within such exclusive jurisdiction, were not residents of the State so as to entitle them to vote, within the meaning of the Constitution, which conferred the elective franchise upon its residents alone."

There is no useful purpose in pursuing this line of argument any further on this point because all of the cases of this Court agree on this position.

It may be useful however to recall that plaintiff has alleged and made affidavit that he was not present in the Circuit Court on May 17, 1947 nor on June 9, 1947 nor at any other time. (R. 11 *et seq.*; R. 21 *et seq.*) The defendant has not only agreed with the statements of the plaintiff but has urged these facts himself in his own arguments even though for different reasons.

It is not controverted before this Court that the plaintiff was in fact confined within the Veterans Administration Hospital all during the events discussed herein.

The affidavit of the Veterans Hospital doctors (Appendix "E") introduced into the record by the defendant; the thirty-five day commitment order (Appendix "F"); the petition filed on May 17, 1947 states on its face that the Veterans Hospital was the one having custody of the plaintiff (R. 9) and it was the defendant who introduced the petition into the record of this case; the

motion of the plaintiff alleges that the plaintiff was confined in the hospital all during these events (see Record, page R. 15, par 21; R. 16, par. 25); and finally the affidavit of the plaintiff relates that the plaintiff was confined within the hospital. (See Record, page R. 21 *et seq.*).

The law and the facts of this case clearly prove that the Circuit Court of Fayette had and has no jurisdiction within the limits of the government hospital reservation upon which the Veterans Administration Hospital is located because of the operation of Article 1, Section 8, Clause 17 of the Federal Constitution. (R. 13, par. 8)

3. Whether a thirty-five day commitment order entered against an inmate of a Veterans Administration Hospital on the same day a petition was filed asking for a lunacy inquest violates the due process of law contrary to the Fourteenth Amendment.

The defendant has urged that the United States District Court was without jurisdiction to review the judgments of the State Court which the defendant introduced in support of his motion to dismiss as a defense of his actions. (R. 8).

The leading and basic case on that problem is that of *Thompson* v. *Whitman*, 18 Wall. 457; 21 Law Ed. 897. At page 467, this Court said:

> "Thus in *Elliott et al.* v. *Peirsol et al.*, it was held that the Circuit Court of the United States for the District of Kentucky might question the jurisdiction of a county court of that State to order a certificate of acknowledgment to be corrected; and for want of such jurisdiction to regard the order as void. Justice Trimble, delivering the opinion of this court in that case, said: 'Where a court has jurisdiction, it has a right to decide every question which occurs in the

cause, and whether its decision be correct or otherwise, its judgment, until reversed, is regarded as binding in every other court. But, if it act without authority, its judgments and orders are regarded as nullities. They are not voidable, but simply void."

And also in *Thompson* v. *Whitman*, supra on page 468:

"But it must be admitted that no decision has ever been made on the precise point involved in the case before us, in which evidence was admitted to contradict the record as to jurisdictional facts asserted therein, and especially as to facts stated to have been passed upon by the court.

"But if it is once conceded that the validity of a judgment may be attacked collaterally by evidence showing that the court had no jurisdiction, it is not perceived, how any allegation contained in the record itself, however strongly made, can affect the right so to question it. The very object of the evidence is to invalidate the paper as a record. If that can be successfully done no statements contained therein have any force."

The doctrine of the *Thompson* case was brought down to our time in the well-known case of *Williams* v. *North Carolina*, 325 U.S. 226; 65 S. Ct. 1092; 89 Law Ed. 1577. At page 229, this Court said that:

"But the Clause does not make a sister-State judgment a judgment in another State. The proposal to do so was rejected by the Philadelphia Convention. 2 Farrand, the records of the Federal Convention of 1787, 447-48. 'To give it the force of a judgment in another state, it must be made a judgment there' *M'Elmoyle* v. *Cohen*, 13 Pet. 312, 325. It can be made a judgment there only if the court purporting to render the original judgment had power to render such a judgment. A judgment in one State is conclusive

upon the merits in every other State, but only if the court of the first State had power to pass on the merits—had jurisdiction, that is, to render judgment.

"It is to late now to deny the right collaterally to impeach a decree of divorce made in another State, by proof that the court had no jurisdiction, even when the record purports to show jurisdiction. . . It was 'too late' more than forty years ago. *German Savings Society* v. *Dormitzer*, 192 U.S. 125, 128."

The plaintiff raised Fourteenth Amendment questions of denial of the due process of law in the complaint in paragraph 13 of Count 1 and paragraphs 10 and 11 of Count 2 at a time when the plaintiff did not have complete information. (R. 5)

After the defendant filed his motion to dismiss and attached copies of the records of the Circuit and County Courts of Fayette in support thereof, the plaintiff filed a counter-motion in opposition to the introduction of those alleged records into evidence against him. (R. 11-19)

The plaintiff raised specific Fourteenth Amendment questions in paragraphs 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 17, 18, 20, 22, and 30, of his motion in opposition to the motion to dismiss, which were never ruled on by either the District Court or the Court of Appeals. (R. 11-19 inc.)

This Court said in the *Civil Rights Cases*, 109 U.S. 3; 3 S. Ct. 18; 27 Law Ed. 835; at page 11 that:

"No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

"It is State action of a particular character that is prohibited. Individual invasion of individual rights is not the subject matter of the amendment. It has a

deeper and broader scope. It nullifies and makes void all State action of every kind, which impairs the privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States, or which injures them in life, liberty or property without due process of law, or which denies to any of them equal protection of the laws."

In a later case, that of *Meyers* v. *State of Nebraska*, 262 U.S. 390; 43 S. Ct. 625; 67 Law Ed. 1042 that:

> "The problem of our determination is whether the statute as construed and applied unreasonably infringes the liberty guaranteed to the plaintiff in error by the Fourteenth Amendment. 'No State shall . . . deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law.'"
>
> "While this Court has not attempted to define with exactness the *liberty* thus guaranteed, the term has received much consideration and some of the included things have been definitely stated. Without doubt, it denotes not merely freedom from bodily restraint but also the right of the individual to contract, to engage in any of the common occupations of life, to acquire useful knowledge, to marry, establish a home and bring up children; to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience, and generally to enjoy those privileges long recognized at common law as essential to the orderly pursuit of happiness by free men."

These cases were brought down to the present day in the language of *Shelley* v. *Kraemer*, 334 U.S. 1; 68 S. Ct. 836; 92 Law Ed. 1161; when this Court said at page 14:

> "That the action of state courts and judicial officers in their official capacities is to be regarded as action of the State within the meaning of the Fourteenth Amendment is a proposition which has long been established by decisions of this Court. That principle

was given expression in the earliest case involving the construction of the terms of the Fourteenth Amendment. Thus, in *Virginia* v. *Rives*, 100 U.S. 313, 318 (1880), this Court stated: 'It is doubtless true that a State may act through different agencies,—either by its legislative, its executive, or its judicial authorities; and the prohibitions of the amendment extend to all action of the state denying the equal protection of the laws, whether it be action by one of these agencies or by another.''

The facts of this case are not controverted for the most part. The plaintiff was transferred administratively from Valley Forge General Hospital as a Lieutenant on active duty in a hospital status to the Veterans Administration Hospital. (R. 39-42, inc.)

The order from Valley Forge General Hospital, exhibit "Q" (R. 40, par. 8) relates that on arrival at the Veterans Hospital the plaintiff was relieved from active duty and reverted to an inactive duty status which of course meant that the plaintiff was not subject to military authority after May 4, 1947.

It is only simple justice which points out that the original fault in this case was the negligence of the office of the Adjutant-General of the Army which office had the duty of returning the plaintiff to the state of his legal residence in Illinois and his home in Chicago upon his relief from active duty.

However the Manager of the Veterans Hospital compounded the negligence of the Adjutant-General's office by not independently determining the legal residence of the plaintiff and by confining the plaintiff in the hospital without legal authority.

The so-called affidavit of the Veterans Hospital doctors, contained in a letter to the Clerk of the Circuit Court of Fayette County on May 15, 1947 was not the petition filed

in the case because there was no case pending on May 15, 1947 between the *Commonwealth of Kentucky* v. *William J. Powers, Jr.* (Appendix "E")

The petition entitled *Commonwealth of Kentucky* v. *William J. Powell* was filed on May 17, 1947 by L. H. Mulligan. (R. 9)

A thirty-five day commitment order under the authority of Chapter 16, Acts of 1936, was issued on the same day, May 17, 1947, against the plaintiff without the presence of the plaintiff in court. (See Appendix "F")

Both the affidavit of the doctors from the Veterans Hospital and the petition filed on May 17, 1947 related that the plaintiff was actually in the Veterans Hospital and not running at large in the county. (R. 9: Appendix "E")

It is perfectly obvious from the record that the plaintiff did not have either notice or the opportunity to appear and defend himself.

In *McFarland* v. *Kentucky*, 249 Ky. at pages 129 and 130, the Court of Appeals of Kentucky said (60 S.W. 2d 360) that:

> "The most sacred rights of the individual are involved in lunacy proceedings—his freedom of person and his right to control his property and for this reason the Legislature has provided certain safeguards for his protection. Our statute prescribes a certain method of procedure to determine whether persons are insane and it must be followed strictly. The inquest in the instant case was not conducted as prescribed but, on the contrary, substantially every requirement of the statute was ignored, and it follows that the judgment declaring the appellant to be a person of unsound mind was and is void."

In *Stewart* v. *Taylor*, 111 Ky. 247 (63 S.W. 783) at page 253, the Court of Appeals said:

> "The mere fact that one may be believed to be a lunatic will not waive the necessity of notice, because that is the very question to be tried. He is entitled to the presumption of sanity until he has been adjudged otherwise on the inquest. To say that one is insane, and therefore need not be notified of the proceeding, is to decide the very question to be, and before it is, tried."

The Supreme Court of the United States, in the case of *Mullane* v. *Central Hanover*, 339 U.S. 306, at page 314 said:

> "Against this interest of the State we must balance the individual interest sought to be protected by the Fourteenth Amendment. This is defined by our holding that 'The fundamental requisite of the due process of law is the opportunity to be heard.' *Grannis* v. *Ordean*, 234 U.S. 385, 394. This right to be heard has little reality or worth unless one is informed that the matter is pending and can choose for himself whether to appear or default, acquiesce or contest."

Both the State of Maine and the State of New Mexico struck down their own thirty-five day commitment statutes as violative of the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.

In the *Appeal of Sleeper*, 147 Maine 302; 87 Atlantic 2nd 115, the Supreme Court of Maine held that the Maine thirty-five commitment statute was void because it did not provide notice or the opportunity to appear and defend.

In *Ex parte Romero*, 51 N.M. 201; 181 P. 2nd 811, in a beautifully written opinion, the Supreme Court of New Mexico struck down the thirty-five day commitment statute of that State because it did not provide notice or an opportunity to appear and defend.

The Court of Appeals of Kentucky has construed the thirty-five day commitment statute only once as far as the plaintiff has been able to discover. In the case of *Smith v. Nall*, 242 S.W. 2nd 755-6, that Court said:

> "This is a habeas corpus proceeding. Curt Smith was committed to Eastern State Hospital for observation under the provisions of K.R.S. 202.120 notwithstanding his demand that he be given a trial by jury to determine his mental condition. This section of the Statutes was embodied in Chapter 16 of the Acts of 1936. The title to that Chapter reads as follows: 'An Act to amend Chapter Sixteen (16) of the Acts of one thousand nine hundred twenty-eight (1928) by adding after Section seventy-seven (77) thereof and before Section seventy-eight (78), a new section to be entitled seventy-seven a (77a) and proving for the temporary commitment for care and observation of persons whose mental condition is so abnormal as to require their temporary commitment for care and observation pending a determination whether or not they are insane.'"

And also on the same page, the Court said:

> "It is apparent at once that Chapter 16 of the Acts of 1936 was specifically made a part of Chapter 16 of the Acts of 1928."

It does not appear that the question of notice and due process was made an issue in that case as to opportunity to appear and defend.

However, in *Smith v. Nall, supra*, the Court did declare that Smith was entitled to a jury trial before he could be committed for thirty-five days for observation.

It would seem that if the rationale of that case be properly considered that notice must be given under Section 72

of Chapter 16, Acts of 1928, which in 1946 was Kentucky Revised Statute 202.060(216aa-72) entitled "*Notice; Summons, Arrest of Dangerous Persons.*"

The above statute explicitly stated that the person summoned did not have to appear and defend before three days after service of summons.

In the present case, even if summons had been served on May 17, 1947, which it was not, the court would not have had statutory jurisdiction to proceed further until at least May 20, 1947 because of that statute.

The plaintiff respectfully asks this Court to declare in the language of *Simon* v. *Craft*, 182 U.S. 427; 21 S. Ct. 836; 45 Law Ed. 1165; that every person is entitled to their day in court and that a thirty-five day commitment statute which does not provide notice and reasonable opportunity to appear and defend violates the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution of the United States.

It might not be out of place here to suggest that perhaps the Circuit Court has confused the common-law power of emergency detention of dangerous persons with the power of statutory commitment.

It should seem fairly obvious to any reasonable person that when a person is actually dangerous to himself or to other persons in the community by reason of unsoundness of mind that such person may be temporarily restrained or confined until the danger is past or legal proceedings initiated in a proper manner. However, the majority of court opinions have held that it is not lunacy alone that justifies emergency detention but only dangerous lunacy when there is overt danger of harm either to the person concerned or to others.

4. Whether a lunacy inquest, growing out of a thirty-five day commitment, violated the due process of law contrary to the Fourth, Fifth, and Fourteenth Amendments where the inmate of a Veterans Administration Hospital is restrained within a federal enclave and prevented by Federal officers from appearing and defending himself.

The one inescapable fact of this case is that the plaintiff's presence in the Veterans Hospital at Lexington, Kentucky was due solely to the exercise of power by the Federal Government through its officers and employees. (R. 39, 40, 41, 42)

The plaintiff was sent there on orders issued by the Department of the Army and he was confined there as a result of those orders although those orders related that he was relieved from active duty.

There are two leading cases from this Court which hold that when a person is held in custody of the United States under claim or color of claim of authority of the United States that such person is immune from state authority until released from the custody of the United States.

In *Ableman* v. *Booth*, 21 Howard 506; 16 Law Ed. 169; at page 523 this Court said:

> "We do not question the authority of a State court, or judge, who is authorized by the laws of the State to issue the writ of habeas corpus, to issue it in any case where the party is imprisoned within its territorial limits, provided it does not appear, when the application is made, that the person imprisoned is in custody under the authority of the United States. * * * But, after the return is made, and the State judge or court is judicially apprised that the party is in custody under the authority of the United States, they can proceed no further. They-they know that the prisoner is within the dominion and jurisdiction of another Government, and that neither the writ of habeas corpus,

nor any other process issued under State authority, can pass over the line or division between the two sovereignties. He is then within the dominion and exclusive jurisdiction of the United States."

And on page 524, *supra*, the Court further said:

"No judicial process, whatever form it may assume, can have any lawful authority outside the limits of the jurisdiction of the court or judge by whom it is issued; and an attempt to enforce it beyond these boundaries is nothing less than lawless violence."

That this was not just an isolated instance is proved by the case known as *Tarble's Case*, 13 Wallace 397. In this case young Tarble lied about his age to enlist in the army. When his father learned about the situation, the father applied to the local Circuit Court of the State of Wisconsin which issued a writ of habeas corpus directed to the lieutenant commanding the detachment in which young Tarble was then detained. At page 402 of 13 Wallace, the Supreme Court of the United States said:

"The question presented may be more generally stated thus: Whether any judge of a State has jurisdiction to issue a writ of habeas corpus, or to continue proceedings under the writ when issued, for the discharge of a person held under the authority, or claim and color of authority of the United States, by an officer of that Government."

And page 403, *supra*, the Court answered the question in the negative:

"The decision of this Court in the two cases which grew out of the arrest of Booth, that of *Ableman* v. Booth, and that of the *United States* v. *Booth*, dispose alike of the claim of jurisdiction by a State court, or a State judge, to interfere with the authority of the United States, whether that authority be exercised by a Federal officer, or be exercised by a Federal tribunal."

SUMMARY

The Argument is summarized briefly as follows:

1. The Veterans Administration Hospital is located on land purchased by the United States before 1940 with the consent of the Legislature of Kentucky resulting in exclusive jurisdiction of the United States under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 17 of the Constitution.

2. The question of exclusive territorial jurisdiction is a distinct federal question.

3. A thirty-five day commitment statute, or a custom and usage under an otherwise valid statute, which denies notice and reasonable opportunity to appear and defend violates the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.

4. Where a person is held in custody under the authority or claim and color of authority of the United States by an officer of that government, the States can have no jurisdiction.

CONCLUSION

The plaintiff conveys his apologies to the learned Justices of this Court for the length of this petition and attempts to justify it only on the grounds that he lacks the experience and skill to present these complicated questions in fewer pages.

Respectfully submitted,

WILLIAM J. POWERS
Plaintiff Pro Se
664 Oakton Street
Des Plaines, Illinois

APPENDIX "A"

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY

Lexington

William J. Powers, Jr. — Plaintiff

vs. — No. 1445

Paul Slaton — Defendant

ORDER

This case is submitted upon the motion of the Defendant Paul Slaton to dismiss this action for declaratory judgment against him for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, and that the motion be treated as one for summary judgment, pursuant to Rule 12b, Rules of Civil Procedure, and disposed of as provided in Rule 56.

It appears from the record that this action is only against Paul Slaton, individually, and that matters outside the pleadings are presented to and not excluded by the Court. In accordance with the provisions of Rule 12b, I am of the opinion that this motion to dismiss should be and is treated as one for summary judgment.

After examination of the record, consideration of the pleadings, affidavits, documents on file and the briefs filed by the respective parties, and being advised, the Court is of the opinion that there is no genuine issue as to any material fact which would entitle plaintiff to a declaratory judgment as against the defendant, Paul Slaton individually and that as a matter of law the Defendant Paul Slaton is entitled to a summary judgment dismissing this action.

It is therefore ordered and Adjudged by the Court that this action should be, and is ordered dismissed.

H. Church Ford

H. Church Ford Judge

A True Copy Attest
Davis T. McGarvey, Clerk
U. S. District Court
By E. L. Cooper
D. C.

March 29, 1962
Copy to:
William J. Powers, Jr.
Frank S. Ginocchio
Sam P. Strother

APPENDIX "B"

(Filed Mar 13 1963 Carl W. Reuss, Clerk)

No. 14972

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
For The Sixth Circuit

WILLIAM J. POWERS, JR.,
Plaintiff-Appellant;
v.
PAUL SLATON,
Defendant-Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Kentucky.

Decided March 13, 1963.

Before: CECIL, Chief Judge, BOYD and THORNTON, District Judges.

PER CURIAM. This is an appeal from an order of the District Court granting defendant's motion to dismiss plaintiff's action for a declaratory judgment which the District Court treated as a motion for a summary judgment pursuant to Rule 12 (b), Fed. R. Civ. P. and disposed of as provided in Rule 56, Fed. R. Civ. P. Plaintiff appeared pro se in both the court below and here. He complains that a judgment of the Fayette Circuit Court of Fayette County, Kentucky entered by that court on June 9, 1947 declaring him to be of unsound mind was null and void. He contends that defendant Paul Slaton has never had any lawful authority to act as Committee for him. He asks that defendant Paul Slaton be ordered to cease and desist from holding himself out as the lawfully appointed Committee of plaintiff. He further asks the Court to order

defendant to account to the lower court and plaintiff for all moneys received from the Treasurer of the United States in the names of plaintiff, and to surrender to plaintiff all such moneys to which the latter may be lawfully entitled (plus interest) as may reasonably be expected to have accrued from the possession of such moneys.

From the record on appeal we furnish the following facts which will provide the necessary background for making a determination of the matter here for review. They are as follows: On May 17, 1947 the petition of Dr. L. H. Mulligan was filed in the Fayette Circuit Court for the Commonwealth of Kentucky asserting that petitioner had information that William J. Powers, Jr. was a person of unsound mind, and asking that an inquest be held to pass upon the subject matter of the petition. After appointing counsel to represent Powers and two medical examiners to examine him, the Court submitted the medical findings of the examiners to a jury on the 9th day of June 1947. The jury returned a verdict that William J. Powers, Jr. was a person of unsound mind, whereupon the Court adopted the verdict of the jury and committed Powers to the United States Veterans Administration Hospital at Lexington, Kentucky. Subsequent to this finding and commitment, Marian R. Powers, as the wife of William J. Powers, Jr. filed a petition with the Fayette County Court for her appointment as his Committee, and on July 26, 1947 an order was entered appointing Powers' wife as his Committee. She continued in this capacity until August 24, 1949 when she tendered her resignation as Committee for her husband, filed her final accounting, and petitioned for the appointment of a successor Committee. The Court, acting upon this petition, entered the following order:

"IT IS ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that the Citizens Bank and Trust Company, Lexington, Kentucky, be and it is hereby appointed as Committee for

William J. Powers, Jr., and that the bond of said Committee be fixed in the amount of Three Thousand Dollars ($3000.00).

"THEREUPON appeared the Citizens Bank and Trust Company, by said Trust Officer, Paul Slaton, and executed bond in the penal sum of THREE THOUSAND DOLLARS ($3000.00) with its capital stock as surety which bond was examined and approved by the Court and the Committee having taken the oath as required under law is now empowered to perform all duties and acts as committee for William J. Powers, Jr."

From the foregoing order it is apparent that defendant Paul Slaton appeared in the proceedings for the express purpose of performing a ministerial act for his employer, the Citizens Bank and Trust Company, in relation to the appointment of the Citizens Bank and Trust Company as Committee for plaintiff. The court proceedings enumerated above clearly reflect that the defendant Paul Slaton was not personally involved in any manner with the affairs of this plaintiff—he did not petition the court for appointment; he was not designated by the court to act in any capacity; he did not hold himself out as Committee for plaintiff nor perform any other act (including the receipt of any moneys) that might render him liable to plaintiff based upon any representation by him as Committee for plaintiff. Since plaintiff's complaints regarding Slaton are without substance, it is evident that his pleadings and the exhibits attached thereto do not constitute a claim upon which relief can be granted. The granting of defendant's motion for a summary judgment was a proper determination by the District Court.

Appellant presents additional questions for review by this court involving the validity of the State Court proceedings. The courts of the Commonwealth of Kentucky afford adequate remedies to a party seeking a determination as to the validity of State Court proceedings.

The order of the District Court granting the motion for summary judgment is affirmed.

APPENDIX "C"

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT

WILLIAM J. POWERS, JR.,
Plaintiff-Appellant

vs. No. 14,972

PAUL SLATON,
Defendant-Appellee

MOTION UNDER RULE 8 AND RULE 22 OF THIS COURT AND RULE 6(c) of FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE FOR EXTENSION TO FILE PETITION FOR REVIEW.

The plaintiff-appellant has prepared a petition for review of the order entered by this Court on March 13, 1963 dismissing his appeal but has not been able to have it reproduced in a manner acceptable under the rules of this Court, within twenty day.

The plaintiff-appellant will rely on the following points:

1. This Court Of Appeals Failed To Find That It Had Jurisdiction To Hear The Case At All Before It Made Findings On The Merits In The Record.
2. The Federal Government Exercises Exclusive Jurisdiction Over The Lexington Veterans Administration Grounds And Buildings Under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 17 Of The Constitution Of The United States.
3. The Petition Of May 17, 1947 Did Not State The Facts Required By Kentucky Revised Statute 202.030 (1946 edition).
4. This Court Failed To Make Any Findings On The Plaintiff's Motion Appearing On Pages 24a to 31a Inclusive Of Plaintiff's Appendix.

5. The Fourteenth Amendment Was Violated When Plaintiff-Appellant Was Denied Notice And Opportunity To Appear And Defend Himself In The Circuit Court Of Fayette County.

This motion was not made for any unnecessary delay but was caused by illness of himself, his wife, and his daughter, with the flu.

MOTION

Wherefore, the plaintiff-appellant respectfully asks this Court for an extension of ten days time to prepare his petition for review for submission to this Court of Appeals.

William J Powers Jr
William J Powers Jr
Plaintiff-Appellant
664 Oakton Street
Des Plaines, Illinois

14,972

Office of the Clerk

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
For the Sixth Circuit
Cincinnati 2, Ohio

Carl W. Reuss
Clerk

April 5, 1963

Mr. William J. Powers, Jr.
664 Oakton Street
Des Plaines, Illinois

Re: William J. Powers, Jr.
vs Paul Slaton—No. 14,972

Dear Mr. Powers:

By direction of the Court I am returning, without filing, the copies of your motion to extend the time for filing a petition for rehearing in the above case.

Please be advised that this motion comes too late, inasmuch as the mandate was issued to the District Court at Lexington, Kentucky on April 4, 1963 and the case is closed on the docket of this court.

Be referring to Rule 22 (1) you will note that any motion for extension of time must be filed within 20 days after entry of judgment in this court. The judgment was entered on March 13, 1963.

Yours very truly
Carl W. Reuss
Carl W. Reuss, Clerk

CWR:HT
Encl.

14,972

Office of the Clerk
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
For the Sixth Circuit
Cincinnati 2, Ohio

Carl W. Reuss
Clerk

April 10, 1963

Mr. William J. Powers, Jr.
664 Oakton Street
Des Plaines, Illinois

Re: William J. Powers, Jr.
vs Paul Slaton—No. 14,972

Dear Mr. Powers:

I presented your letter of April 8 to the Court and am directed to advise you that the Court recognizes Rule 6(e) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, but this rule has no application to the situation in your case.

Yours very truly
Carl W. Reuss
Carl W. Reuss, Clerk

CWR:HT
Encl.

P.S. Since writing the above letter I received the enclosed copies of motion, which I am again returning to you.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

No. ....., October Term, 1962

WILLIAM J. POWERS, JR.,

Petitioner,

vs.

PAUL SLATON

ORDER EXTENDING TIME TO FILE PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Upon Consideration of the application of petitioner,

It Is Ordered that the time for filing petition for writ of certiorari in the above-entitled cause be, and the same is hereby, extended to and including

August 10, 1963.

S. POTTER STEWART
Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Dated this 6th
day of June 1963.

APPENDIX "D"

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVE

72d Congress — Report

1st Session — No. 1267

To Authorize The Transfer of Certain Lands in Fayette County, Ky., to the Commonwealth of Kentucky

---

May 10, 1932. Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed

---

Mr. Spence, from the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 10825]

The Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 10825) to authorize transfer of certain lands in Fayette County, Ky., to the Commonwealth of Kentucky, having considered the same, reports favorably thereon with the recommendation that the bill do pass, amended as follows:

(Land description omitted)

The amendments are made at the request of the Veterans' Administration to prevent any misinterpretation of the description of the strip of land to be granted the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

The State of Kentucky has agreed to take over from the county and maintain the Leestown Pike, which forms the north boundary line of the Veterans' Administration hospital reservation at Lexington, and provides the main entrance thereto, providing the width of this road is increased from 30 to 60 feet.

In order to accomplish this, Judge Chester D. Adams of the Fayette County Court, has requested the Federal Government to grant an additional strip of land, approximately 15 feet wide, along the north boundary line of the hospital reservation. The total amount of land required by the State is approximately 3,267 acres. Of this amount, approximately 1,391 acres are now being used in the roadway, as the present boundary line of the reservation runs along the center line of the Leestown Pike. This leaves approximately 1.876 acres of additional land required.

The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, in his letter of May 3, 1932, has advised the committee that with the above-cited changes, favorable consideration of the passage of the bill is recommended. His letter is made a part of this report and reads as follows:

Veterans' Administration,
Washington, May 3, 1932

Hon. John E. Rankin,

Chairman Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

My Dear Mr. Rankin: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of April 22, 1932, transmitting a copy of H. R. 10825, Seventy-second Congress, asking a report in duplicate thereon and for such views as it may be desirable to communicate. The bill is entitled "A bill to authorize the transfer of certain lands in Fayette County, Ky., to the Commonwealth of Kentucky."

The bill is returned with certain changes in punctuation and capitalization suggested by pencil notations on the bill. These changes are formal in character and in no way affect the substance of the bill.

With the changes suggested this administration recommends favorable consideration of the passage of the bill.

A copy of this letter is inclosed for your use.

Very truly yours,

Frank T. Hines, *Administrator.*

APPENDIX "E"

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION
HOSPITAL
Lexington, Kentucky
May 15, 1957

8210

Your File Reference:
In Reply to: LXH10C-1
POWERS, William J.
C-Not Assigned

Mr. George E. DeLong
Clerk, Fayette Circuit Court
Lexington, Kentucky

Dear Sir:

This is to advise that Mr. William J. Powers is eligible for hospitalization and that facilities are available for his reception at this hospital upon commitment by court of proper jurisdiction.

Very truly yours,

S. R. Baker
S. R. Baker, M. D.
Clinical Director

States of Kentucky)
County of Fayette)

POWERS, William J.

IN RE:
ALLEGED TO BE INCOMPETENT

This is to state that William J. Powers has been a patient at the Veterans Administration Hospital, Lexington, Kentucky, since May 4, 1947. At the present time he is considered psychotic (insane), which renders him incompetent to manage his own affairs, and requires supervision and control for his own welfare.

This statement is based on our knowledge of the condition of William J. Powers as a result of our examination and observation of him during the time he has been a patient at this hospital.

This certificate is made as a matter of providing the court of jurisdiction with information regarding his incompetency in order that his need for commitment and the appointment of a committee may be properly inquired into.

Because of the mental and physical condition of William J. Powers it is not believed that it would be advisable for him to appear in court at this time.

C. I. Schwartz
C. I. Schwartz, M. D.
Ward Physician.

S. R. Baker
S. R. Baker, M. D.
Clinical Director

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 15th day of May, 1947, at Lexington, Kentucky.

Anne Moore (Frost)
Notary Public, Fayette Co., Ky.
My commission expires 5-27-48

APPENDIX "F"

FAYETTE CIRCUIT COURT

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY Plaintiff

vs. AFFIDAVIT AND ORDER

WILLIAM J. POWERS, JR. Defendant
Veterans Administration Hospital.

The Affiants L. H. Mulligan and Thomas Shannon, say, that they are practicing physicians of Fayette County, Kentucky appointed to examine the defendant; that they have made an examination of the defendant William J. Powers, Jr., against whom a lunacy proceeding has been started in the Fayette Circuit Court; that said defendant's present condition is so abnormal that the safety of the defendant requires that he be committed for a period of care and further medical examination and observation of his mental condition, it is necessary and proper that said defendant should at once be taken to the Veterans Administration Hospital at Lexington, Kentucky, for observation and treatment pending the determination of the said lunacy proceedings; that it would be dangerous for the defendant's safety and for the safety of the public for the defendant not to be at once sent to said Hospital.

L. H. Mulligan
Thomas A. Shannon, M.D.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 17th day of May, 1947.

Geo. E. DeLong, C. F. C. C.
By: *John B DeLong* D.C.

It appearing from the foregong affidavits of Doctors L. H. Mulligan, and Thomas A. Shannon, that the defendant William J. Powers, Jr., against whom a lunacy proceeding is now pending in the Fayette Circuit Court, is in such abnormal physical and mental condition, that said defendant should at once be removed to the Veterans Administration Hospital at Lexington, Kentucky, for observation and treatment, and that it would be dangerous for said defendant and for the public for said defendant not to be sent to said Hospital immediately, it is ordered and adjudged that the Sheriff of Fayette County take the said defendant and deliver the said defendant to the said Hospital at Lexington, Kentucky, there to be held for a period of care and further medical examination, not to exceed thirty-five days or until the further order of Court pending the determination of the said insanity inquest. The Superintendent of the said Hospital is directed to hold said defendant for observation and treatment under Chapters 16, Acts 1936, until the determination of such trial, unless otherwise ordered by the Court.

Chester D. Adams
Judge, Fayette Circuit Court

APPENDIX "G"

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY
ACTS OF 1936
Pages 47, 48, 49.

CHAPTER 16.

AN ACT to amend Chapter sixteen (16) of the Acts of one thousand nine hundred twenty-eight (1928) by adding after Section seventy-seven (77) thereof and before Section seventy-eight (78) thereof a new section tion to be entitled Section seventy-seven a (77a) and providing for the temporary commitment for care and observation of persons whose mental condition is so abnormal as to require their temporary commitment for care and observation pending a determination whether or not they are insane.

Be it enacted by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky:

If the certificate of the medical examiners mentioned in the preceding sections, instead of stating that in the opinion of such examiners the person is insane, shall state in substance that in the opinion of such examiners the mental condition of the person is so abnormal that the safety of the person or of the public requires that he be committed for a period of care and further medical examination and observation of his mental condition, upon the filing of such certificate by the court may order such person to state hospital for the insane or to a city or county hospital in the county having a psychopathic ward or facilities suitable, in the court's opinion, for the care and medical examination and observation of mental diseases, for

a period of care and further medical examination and observation of the mental condition of such person not to exceed thirty five (35) days. Within thirty (30) days after such commitment, if the superintendent of the institution to which the person has been committed shall be of the opinion that the person is sane, he shall so certify to the judge who committed him, who shall thereupon order the discharge of the person, and it shall be the duty of the clerk to mail an attested copy of such order to the superintendent of the institution to which the person was committed. Within thirty (30) days after such commitment, if the superintendent of the institution to which the person has been committed be of the opinion that the person is insane, he shall so certify to the judge who committed him, whereupon, the judge shall again appoint two medical examiners as provided in section two hundred sixteen aa-seventy six (216aa-76) Carroll's Kentucky Statutes, one thousand nine hundred thirty (1930) Edition, and upon the filing of their certificates as provided in Section two hundred sixteen aa-seventy-seven (216aa-77), Carroll's Kentucky Statutes, one thousand nine hundred thirty (1930) Edition, the action shall proceed as provided in Sections two hundred sixteen aa-sixty-eight (216aa-76) to two hundred sixteen aa-ninety-four (216aa-94) inclusive Carroll's Kentucky Statutes, one thousand nine hundred thirty (1930) Edition.

Approved February 18, 1936.

APPENDIX "H"

VERBATIM TEXT OF RELEVANT KENTUCKY STATUTES NOT PRINTED ELSEWHERE IN THIS BRIEF. (1946 Edition)

K.R.S. 202.110 (216aa-77) CONTENTS OF PHYSICIANS' CERTIFICATE; FORM.

(1) The certificate shall state that the defendant has been examined by each of the medical examiners making the certificate within three days prior to the date of the certificate, and that in their judgment he is an idiot or is feeble-minded, epileptic or insane, if such be the fact, and that he requires supervision, control, and care for his own welfare or for the welfare of others or of the community.

(2) The certificate shall further state whether such supervision, control and care can best be provided by commitment to an institution for the feeble-minded, the epileptic or for the insane, or by commitment to guardianship.

(3) The certificate shall be in the form prescribed by the Department of Welfare and shall state the facts and circumstances upon which the judgment of the medical examiners is based; and shall be sworn to before a notary or the clerk or judge of the court.

Note: The text printed in the paragraphs below is that of Chapter 16, Acts of 1936, (Appendix "F"), as amended by Chapter 29, Acts of 1944, as amended by Chapter 178, Acts of 1946, and as found in Chapter 202 of the 1946 edition of the Kentucky Revised Statutes.

K.R.S. 202.120 (216aa-77a) PERSONS HELD FOR FURTHER EXAMINATION; THIRTY-FIVE DAY COMMITMENT; COMMITMENT TO VETERANS ADMINISTRATION; CERTIFICATION AS TO CONDITION.

(1) If the certificate of the medical examiners men-

tioned in KRS 202.110 states in substance that in the opinion of such examiners the mental condition of the person is so abnormal that the safety of the person or of the public requires that he be committed for a period of care and further medical examination and observation of his mental condition, the court may commit such person to a state hospital for the insane, or to a city or county hospital in the county having a psychopathic ward or facilities suitable, in the court's opinion, for the care and medical examination and observation of mental diseases, or, upon receipt of a certificate in writing from the United States Veterans Administration or other agency of the United States Government that facilities are available and that such person is eligible for care or treatment therein, to the said United States Veterans Administration or other agency of the United States Government, for a period of care and further medical examination and observation of the mental condition of such person not to exceed thirty-five days.

(2) Not relevant in this case.

(3) Within thirty days after such commitment, if the superintendent, and the clinical director or staff physician acting in the latter capacity, of the institution to which the person has been committed, or, in the case of a commitment to the United States Veterans Administration or other federal agency, the responsible medical officer and a staff physician of the administration or other agency, find that the person is insane (psychotic), they shall so certify to the court which committed him. Thereupon an inquest shall be held in accordance with the provisions of this chapter, and upon the trial the testimony of the physicians appointed under KRS 202.100 may be heard, and the certificate above referred to in this subsection shall also be admissible in evidence. (1944, c29, sec. 1; 1946, c178, sec. 1.)

APPENDIX "I"

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY

Acts of 1928

Pages 110-114 inc.

§ 68. Inquest; Jurisdiction. The circuit courts of the several counties of this state shall have exclusive jurisdiction of all inquests concerning the condition of the mind or mental faculty of persons. When no circuit court is in session in the county, inquests of insane persons may be held by a judge of a circuit court or by the presiding judge of the county court, but in no case shall an inquest upon an idiot or a person convicted of crime and confined in the penitentiary or reformatory, be held except in the circuit court, and if the inquest is upon a convict it shall only be held at a regular term of said court.

§ 69. Inquest, Except Criminals; How Instituted. Any reputable person being a resident of the county and having knowledge of a person in the county, not serving a sentence in a penitentiary or reformatory under a criminal charge, who appears to be either feeble minded, an epileptic, insane person or an idiot, who is not in a state or private institution for the care of such person may file with the clerk of the circuit court a petition in writing for the trial and committal of such person and setting forth facts verified by affidavit. It shall be sufficient, if the affidavit is upon information and belief.

§ 70. Petition for Inquest; What It Shall State. The petition, verified as required in the preceding section, shall set forth the age and residence of the person concerning whom the petition is filed, the names, residence of the parents or guardians, if known, and of the husband or wife, if any, and the name and residence of the nearest relative,

custody, control and supervision of such person; or if no such person is known to the petitioner, then of some near relative or that such is unknown to the petitioner.

§ 71. Court to Appoint Attorney; Commonwealth's Attorney. In any case of inquest the court shall appoint some member of the bar to represent and protect the interests and rights of the person alleged to be of unsound mind, and it shall also be the duty of the attorney for the commonwealth to prevent the finding of any person to be of unsound mind who, in his opinion is not such.

§ 72. Notice of Inquest; Person to be Notified; Service of Summons. All persons named in the petition, including the alleged feeble-minded person, epileptic, insane person or idiot, if of legal age, shall be notified of such proceeding by a summons issued, requiring the parent or parents, guardian or other person having the custody, control or supervision of such person or with whom such person may be, to appear with such person at a time and place to be stated in the summons, which time shall not be less than three (3) days after service. The parents of such person if living, if their residence be known to the petitioner, or the legal guardian, if one there be, and his residence is known to the petitioner, or if there be neither parent or guardian whose residence is known to the petitioner, then some near relative, if his or her residence be known to the petitioner, shall be notified also of the proceedings.

§ 73. Failure of Person Summoned to Appear; When Court May Hold Inquest. If a person summoned as herein provided shall fail without reasonable cause to appear and abide by the order of the court, he may be proceeded against as in the case of contempt of court. On the return of the summons or other process, or on the appearance of such alleged feeble-minded, epileptic, insane person

or idiot with or without summons or other process in person before the court, together with the return of service of notice, if there be any person notified, or upon the personal appearance or written consent to the proceedings of the person or persons, if any be notified, or as soon thereafter as may be, the court shall proceed to hear and dispose of the case.

§ 74. Trial by Jury, if Desired. In proceeding under this act the person alleged to be feeble-minded, epileptic or insane, and appearing before the court, of any person interested in such person, shall have the right to demand for such alleged feeble-minded, epileptic or insane person a trial by jury, which shall be granted as in other cases, unless waived; or the court on its own motion may call a jury to try such case. The court in its discretion may conduct the trial or inquest in chambers.

§ 75. Evidence; Witnesses May be Summoned. The court may in its discretion require other evidence in addition to the petition and the certificates of the examining physicians, and he may require the attendance at the hearing of said physicians and of any other witnesses. The alleged feeble-minded, epileptic, insane person or idiot or any one representing him shall have the right to summon witnesses and to present evidence as in other cases made and provided.

§ 76. Examining Physician; Qualifications; Fee Paid by County; Certificate. When a petition for the trial and commitment of an alleged feeble-minded, epileptic, idiot or insane person has been properly filed with the clerk of the court, the court shall appoint two physicians to examine such persons and to certify to the court as to their findings in the case. These physicians shall be selected where possible because they have made special study of feeble-mindedness and mental diseases and shall be entitled to a

fee of $3.00 each for such examination and certificate, to be paid by the county in which the commitment is made, upon a certified copy of an order of allowance made by the circuit court holding the inquest.

§ 77. Examination; Certificate, What It Shall State; To Be Verified. The certificate shall state that the person has been examined by each of the medical examiners making the certificate within three days prior to the date of the certificate, and that in their judgment he is an idiot or is feeble-minded, epileptic or insane in the sense of this act as the case may be, if such be the fact, and requires supervision, control and care for his own welfare or for the welfare of others or of the community; and it shall further state whether such supervision, control and care can best be provided by commitment to an institution for the feeble-minded, the epileptic or for the insane, or by commitment to guardianship. The certificate shall be in the form prescribed by the State Board of Charities and Corrections, and shall state the facts and circumstances upon which the judgment of the medical examiners is based, and shall be sworn to before a notary or the clerk or judge of the court.

§ 78. Presence of Persons Charged; When Dispensed With. No inquest shall be held unless the person charged to be an idiot, insane, feeble-minded or epileptic is in court; provided, however, that the personal presence of such person may be dispensed with when it shall appear by the oath or affidavit of two regular practicing physicians that they have personally examined such person and that they verily believe that his condition is such that it would be unsafe to bring him into court.

§ 79. Inquest; Oath to be Administered to Jury; Form of; Instructions of Court. The following oath shall be administered to the jury: "You do swear that you will

well and truly inquire, and from the evidence say, in your verdict, whether A B, the person whom you have in charge, is of unsound mind, and if of unsound mind, whether he is an idiot or lunatic—that is, whether he was destitute of mind from infancy or has lost it since birth; and if he has lost it since his birth, that you will state when, and as far as you can from the evidence the cause of it. You will also inquire and state his birth and residence, and whether he has been brought into this state by any person, and by whom, for the purpose of becoming a charge upon the Commonwealth. That you will find what estate, the value thereof, he owns in possession, reversion, or remainder; whether his parents are alive; where they reside; and whether they have estate sufficient to support the person under trial; whether he is capable of laboring in whole or in part, and what part, for his support." The judge shall instruct the jury upon the whole case, so as to enable them to decide the question whether the defendant is an idiot or lunatic.

But this oath shall not be confused with or in any wise conflict with the oath to be given upon the inquest of an imbecile as prescribed in section 2156.

§6. Pauper; Who Is; Verdict; Orders of Court. A person is a pauper, idiot, or lunatic,

APPENDIX "J"

SELECTED SECTIONS FROM THE BILL OF RIGHTS OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY.

Section 1. *Rights of Life, Liberty, Worship, Pursuit of Safety, etc.*

"All men are, by nature, free and equal, and have certain inherent and inalienable rights, among which may be reckoned:

First: The right of enjoying and defending their lives and liberties."

Section 2. *Absolute and arbitrary power denied.*

"Absolute and arbitrary power over the lives, liberty and property of free men exists nowhere in a republic, not even in the largest majority."

Section 7. *Right of trial by jury.*

"The ancient mode of trial by jury shall be held sacred and the right thereof remain inviolate, subject to such modifications as may be authorized by this Constitution."

Section 10. *Security from Search and Seizure.*

"The people shall be secure in their persons, houses, papers and possessions from unreasonable search and seizure; and no warrant shall issue to search any place, or seize any person or thing, without describing them as nearly as may be, nor without probable cause supported by oath or affirmation."

Section 13. *Right of judicial remedy for injury, speedy trial.*

"All courts shall be open, and every person for an injury done him in his land, goods, person, or reputation, shall have remedy by due course of law, and right and justice administered without sale, denial, or delay."

Section 16. *Right to bail; habeas corpus.*

"* * * and the privilege of the writ of habeas corpus shall not be suspended unless when, in the case of rebellion or invasion, the public safety may require it."

Section 26. *General powers subordinate to Bill of Rights. Laws contrary thereto are void.*

"To guard against transgressions of the high powers we have delegated, we declare that everything in this Bill of Rights is excepted out of the general powers of government, and shall forever remain inviolate; and all laws contrary thereto, or contrary to this Constitution, shall be void."

APPENDIX "K"

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY
ACTS OF 1944

PAGE 388
CHAPTER 173
(H. B. 389)

AN ACT to perfect the Kentucky Revised Statutes by repealing certain provisions that have been impliedly repealed or have become obsolete, or have been held unconstitutional by the Court of Appeals, correcting erroneous transposition of words and figures, correcting inadvertent changes of language, and restoring provisions of former statutes that were omitted under a misapprehension or by inadvertence.

Be it enacted by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky:

§ 1. Section 3,010 of the Kentucky Revised Statutes is amended to read as follows:

The Commonwealth of Kentucky consents to the acquisition by the United States of all lands and appurtenances in this state heretofore legally acquired, or that may be hereafter legally acquired by purchase, or by condemnation, for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dock yards, post offices, custom houses, courthouses and other needful buildings, and for locks, dams and canals in improving the navigation of the rivers and waters within and on the borders of Kentucky.

APPENDIX "L"

STATE OF KENTUCKY, COUNTY OF FAYETTE
AUGUST TERM, 1949
AUGUST 24th, 1949

IN THE MATTER OF THE COMMITTEESHIP
OF WILLIAM J. POWERS, JR., Incompetent

PETITION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEE

Comes the Petitioner, Marian R. Powers, and states that she is a resident of Jefferson County, Kentucky and resides at 140 Southland Drive, Louisville, Kentucky; that she is the husband of William J. Powers, Jr., incompetent.

Your Petitioner further states that William J. Powers, Jr., is a resident of Cook County, Chicago, Illinois; that he is entitled to receive Officers' Retirement Pay from the Veterans Administration in the amount of $157.50 per month.

Your Petitioner further states that she was appointed and qualified as committee for William J. Powers, Jr., by the Fayette County Court, Lexington, Kentucky on July 26, 1947; that she has filed her final settlement and tendered her resignation as such committee; that she has on hand at the present time an estate consisting of $431.67, cash, on deposit in the Central Trust Company, Owensboro, Kentucky, and U. S. Government Bonds in the amount of $618.75 (cost); that the appointment of a successor is a condition precedent to the payment of retirement benefits, referred to herein.

Wherefore, your Petitioner Prays the court to appoint a committee for William J. Powers, Jr. and that said committee be required to qualify by executing bond in the penal sum of $3,000.00.

Marian R. Powers
Petitioner

STATE OF KENTUCKY, COUNTY OF FAYETTE

Marian R. Powers, being first duly sworn says that she is the petitioner named in the foregoing petition; that she has read the statements contained therein and, that they are true as she verily believes.

Marian R. Powers, Petitioner

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 19th day of August, 1949.

Robert E. Puryear
Authority Veterans Administration